

REMARKS

A. Request for Reconsideration

Applicants have carefully considered the matters raised by the Examiner in the outstanding Office Action but remain of the position that patentable subject matter is present. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the Examiner's position based on the amendments to the specification, the amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

B. Claim Status

Claims 35-58 are presented for further prosecution. Claims 1-34 have been canceled by this amendment.

C. The Office Action

In section 12 of the Office Action, the Examiner had indicated that claims 6, 24, 26, 27 and 32-34 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants have placed claims 6, 24, 26, 32 and 34 in independent form in order to place the Application in condition for allowance. The following Table compares the subject matter of canceled claims 1-6 and 21-34 with newly added claims 35-58.

New claim	Subject matter of previous claims	New claim	Subject matter of previous claims
<u>35</u>	1, 3, 4, 26	47	4
36	2	48	5
37	5	49	23
38	6	50	24
39	21	<u>51</u>	1, 24
40	22	<u>52</u>	29, 30, 31, 32
41	23	53	33
42	24	54	34
43	25	<u>55</u>	29, 34
44	28	56	30
<u>45</u>	1, 6	57	31
46	3	58	33

As shown in the above Table, independent claim 35 includes the subject matter of allowable claim 26, independent claim 45 includes the subject matter of allowable claim 6, independent claim 51 includes the subject matter of allowable claim 24, independent claim 52 includes the subject matter of allowable claim 32 and independent claim 55 includes the subject matter of allowable claim 34. The remaining claims are all ultimately dependent upon independent claims 35, 45, 51, 52 or 55.

Applicants respectfully submit that each of the claims 35-58 are in condition for allowance.

D. Specification Objections

The Examiner had objected to the specification since all the trademarks had not been capitalized.

Applicants have reviewed the specification and capitalized each trademark. It is believed that all of the trademarks are now capitalized.

E. Rejection to Claim 28 under 35 USC § 112

Claim 28 had been rejected as indefinite. The Examiner had stated that it is not clear whether claim 28 requires one releasing agent or four releasing agents.

The subject matter of claim 28, now presented in claim 44, has been amended to clarify that at least one releasing agent is required. It is believed that claim 44 complies with section 112.

F. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any extensions of time or fees

be necessary in order to maintain this Application in pending condition, appropriate requests are hereby made and authorization is given to debit Account # 02-2275.

Respectfully submitted,

LUCAS & MERCANTI, LLP

By:

Donald C Lucas

Donald C. Lucas, 31,275  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
475 Park Avenue South, 15<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10016  
Tel. # 212-661-8000

Encl: Return receipt postcard